



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2015

Media ownership and journalistic initiative: a six country comparison of “Enterprise Reporting” in online news

Humprecht, Edda ; Esser, Frank

Abstract: This study examines the amount of enterprise reporting, based on original news gathering by in-house staff, at 48 online news sites from six news systems (United States, Great Britain, Germany, Switzerland, France, and Italy). It uses three factors to explain differences in enterprise reporting: at the organizational level, editorial mission (profit or quality-oriented goals) and revenue structure (significant or minor advertising dependency), and at the national level, professionalism and journalistic autonomy of news journalism (liberal, democratic-corporatist or polarized-pluralist media system). A content analysis of roughly 1,660 political news stories finds that the most favorable opportunity structures for manifest enterprise reporting are: independence from political influence and public ownership as well as structures allowing a low level of advertising reliance and an editorial mission toward quality. Conclusions regarding online journalism and the requirements of democracy are drawn.

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-204736>

Book Section

Accepted Version



The following work is licensed under a Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License.

Originally published at:

Humprecht, Edda; Esser, Frank (2015). Media ownership and journalistic initiative: a six country comparison of “Enterprise Reporting” in online news. In: Xinxun, Wu. International Media Industry Review. Shanghai, China: China International Radio Press, 1-20.

**Media Ownership and Journalistic Initiative:
A Six Country Comparison of “Enterprise Reporting” in Online News**

Edda Humprecht & Frank Esser

University of Zurich

Institute of Mass Communication and Media Research, IPMZ

Andreas St 15

8050 Zurich

Switzerland

Abstract

This study examines the amount of enterprise reporting, based on original news gathering by in-house staff, at 48 online news sites from six news systems (United States, Great Britain, Germany, Switzerland, France, and Italy). It uses three factors to explain differences in enterprise reporting: at the organizational level, editorial mission (profit or quality-oriented goals) and revenue structure (significant or minor advertising dependency), and at the national level, professionalism and journalistic autonomy of news journalism (liberal, democratic-corporatist or polarized-pluralist media system). A content analysis of roughly 1,660 political news stories finds that the most favorable opportunity structures for manifest enterprise reporting are: independence from political influence and public ownership as well as structures allowing a low level of advertising reliance and an editorial mission toward quality. Conclusions regarding online journalism and the requirements of democracy are drawn.

Keywords: enterprise reporting, news production, online media, commercialization and content analysis

Media Ownership and Journalistic Initiative:

A Cross-National Comparison of “Enterprise Reporting” in Online News

The news media are expected to play an important role in democracy. They are crucial for making politicians responsive to public concerns and for holding politicians accountable for their actions. Therefore, the news media are expected to provide transparent and reliable information, enlightened analysis, critical scrutiny, and diverse public-affairs coverage that is also suitable for mobilizing participation (Christians, Glasser, McQuail, Nordenstrang, & White, 2009; McQuail, 1992). From a business perspective, however, this kind of reporting may not be very lucrative. Indeed, some news organizations don't seem to mind playing different roles that potentially undermine the information value of news coverage. For citizens, this would mean a lack of access to substantive, undistorted, and diverse information as well as reduced opportunities to deliberate public issues. In addition, a failing media market is likely to impair citizens' capabilities to evaluate political outcomes properly for their contribution to the public good. This, in summary, poses serious challenges to a vibrant public sphere and thus to democratic life.

Understanding Enterprise Reporting

In order to produce news coverage that serves democracy, news outlets have to acknowledge their public responsibility and invest in their editorial operations and journalistic workforce. The size of the newsroom staff plays an important role because reporting requires time and resources (see e.g., Domingo et al., 2008). In reality, however, unstable market conditions – particularly dwindling news audiences and shrinking advertising revenues – seem to affect the quality of news negatively (Downie & Schudson, 2009). More and more people switch to the Internet for political information, but online news providers find it even more difficult than traditional media to cover their operational expenses and establish a sound financial model (Quandt, 2008; Steensen, 2011). These difficult conditions have led some critics to blame online journalism for putting too little emphasis on providing original reporting,

in-depth information and thorough analysis. Yet, these are the prerequisites for what Downie and Schudson (2009) call “accountability journalism” (p. 5). By that they mean a type of reporting that holds government officials and administration accountable to the legal and moral standards of public service and keeps business and professional leaders accountable to society’s expectations of integrity and fairness.

This study is interested in a key prerequisite of accountability journalism, namely, “enterprise reporting.” We define enterprise reporting as *independent reporting that originates from in-house newsroom staff and includes on-site research, first-hand investigations, obtaining background information, and conducting original interviews* (see Hansen, 1991; Kurpius, 2002). It should not be confused with exceptional yet rare forms of investigative journalism à la Watergate, but rather refers to original independent reporting that includes research by in-house staff and goes beyond the most readily available material from news agencies or other cost-effective sources.

Observing Enterprise Reporting

Research has shown that enterprise reporting leads to a greater diversity of viewpoints and sources and that it meets the normative goal of an informed citizenry in pluralistic democracies more successfully than standardized, news-agency-driven reporting (Hansen, 1991). News organizations have commercial reasons to make this kind of reporting known to the audience. Enterprise reporting helps news organizations build a “brand identity” of providing trustworthy, value-added information (Chan-Olmsted, 2005; Siegert, Gerth, & Rademacher, 2011). Clearly identifiable pointers to enterprise reporting help readers recognize the value and thus the quality of news and make them more likely to return to an outlet and become regular customers (Jones, 2010; Tewksbury & Rittenberg, 2012). This leads us to conclude that enterprise reporting – if part of a conscious editorial strategy – will be noticeable in stories and hence *observable by way of content analysis*.

Nevertheless, not all news outlets will be able or willing to produce enterprise reporting. Stetka and Örnebring (2013) describe it as a costly and demanding practice that “requires more time and resources than regular news reporting” (p. 415). The authors argue that this type of reporting relies on financial autonomy and is not easily affordable in times of crisis. This seems plausible in light of recent revelations showing that cutting newsroom budgets has become a popular strategy of news organizations to respond to deteriorating economic conditions (Nielsen, 2012; Picard, 2010).

Explaining Differences in Enterprise Reporting

Picard and van Weezel (2008) discuss different forms of media ownership such as public, private, and employee ownership and examine their economic and managerial foundations. They find that financially strong and stable media organizations are most likely to perform well in terms of public interest. More importantly, it has been established that different forms of ownership and revenue structure have implications for *organizational goals* of news outlets, particularly with regard to their market (profit) orientation and their professional (quality) orientation (Demers, 1996; Krumsvik, Skogerbø, & Storsul, 2013).

At the national level, organizations are embedded in wider political and economic parameters. Interestingly, many differences in media systems as described by Hallin and Mancini (2004) have been found to continue to persist in the online age (Benson, Blach-Ørsten, Powers, Willig, & Zambrano, 2012). We are interested in whether this is also true for journalistic initiative. For instance, Donsbach (1995) found in the early 1990s that reporters from the United States and Great Britain conducted more of their own research and relied less on news agency material than journalists in Germany or Italy. He traces this back to a longer history of media autonomy and the earlier evolution of a hard-news paradigm in Anglo-American countries. Hallin and Mancini (2004) link these differences in news practices to varying degrees of journalistic professionalization. They discuss several indicators for journalistic professionalism, foremost among them being professional autonomy, the emergence of distinct profes-

sional norms and public-service orientation as opposed to serving their clientele's interests. According to their model of media systems, the Northern European democratic-corporatist media systems and the Anglo-American liberal media systems score higher in journalistic professionalism than Mediterranean polarized pluralist systems.

Undoubtedly, at the macro level of media systems as well as at the organizational level, contextual conditions play an important role for predicting differences in news performance (see e.g., Curran, Iyengar, Lund, & Salovaara-Moring, 2009; Ferree, Gamson, Gerhards, & Rucht, 2002). It is necessary to link any media outcome – in our case *enterprise reporting* – to both *national* and *organizational* structures because their interaction can be assumed.

In order to explain how online news outlets implement different levels of enterprise reporting as part of their market position, we draw on a model of media-brand identity by Siegert et al. (2011). It suggests that the development of a media brand is influenced – at the structural level – by political, social, regulatory, economic, and technological factors; and furthermore – at an organizational level – by the revenue structure, competitive situation, and overall editorial mission. Hence, we assume that three main factors influence enterprise reporting: the *revenue structure* (for instance, high- or low-level of advertising dependency), the *editorial mission* (for instance, profit or quality-oriented organizational goals), and the degree of professionalism at the *media-system* level (for instance, greater proximity to the market or to the state). The first two factors are located at the organizational and the last one at the national level.

To understand better how these factors influence the performance of online news outlets, we compare organizations with different types of ownership. These ownership types are assumed to vary in their editorial mission and degree of commercialization. We draw on a distinction made by Picard and van Weezel (2008) to introduce here a slightly different classification of online media ownership:

- *private broadcasters* (corporate-owned with profit-oriented organizational goals),
- *public broadcasters* (financed by fees as well as public or state funds, with primarily a public service mission),
- *corporate newspapers* (owned by media conglomerate or stock-exchange-listed company with profit-oriented goals),
- *independent newspapers* (alternative ownership form without primary profit orientation),
- *popular newspapers* (tabloid-style mass-market outlet with profit orientation), and
- *made-for-web news providers* (either online-only pure player or – where nonexistent – online news-provider with an independent profile and organizational structure).

We include popular outlets because they are usually corporate-owned and expected to exhibit a concise editorial mission that emphasizes entertainment and restricts in-depth substance. Made-for-web news outlets, on the other hand, are expected to pursue an editorial mission of quality-information supply because, as fairly recent market additions, they have to make special efforts to establish their brands. All types of media ownership are assumed to represent single combinations of certain editorial missions and revenue structures.

In order to distinguish different levels of professionalism of news journalism, our comparative design includes media systems from the liberal, the democratic-corporatist, and the polarized-pluralist model as described by Hallin and Mancini (2004).

Hypotheses

Should online news-outlets choose to make enterprise reporting part of their organizational strategy, it will be made noticeable to the audience and hence measurable through content analysis. The available evidence further suggests that enterprise reporting is a function of three factors: *revenue structure*, *editorial mission*, and the surrounding *media systems*. Based on our previous argumentation, we derive the following hypotheses:

H1: Because the editorial mission influences decisions for enterprise reporting, we expect made-for-web organizations that are intent on establishing new brands to display high amounts of enterprise reporting despite having relatively limited resources.

H2: Because public media combine an editorial mission that is geared to the common good and a revenue structure that guarantees economic stability without advertising dependency, they will show higher amounts of enterprise reporting than commercial outlets.

H3: Because enterprise reporting is associated with professional autonomy, we expect news outlets from media systems with high journalistic professionalization (liberal and democratic-corporatist news systems) to show higher amounts of enterprise reporting.

H4: Because the decision to emphasize enterprise reporting is tied to the editorial mission of the organization, differences between media systems (at the national level) are expected to explain this to a lesser degree than differences in types of ownership (at the organizational level).

Sampling and Coding

To ensure inclusion of a sufficient variety of editorial missions and revenue structures, we selected eight online news outlets per country with different types of ownership. Within each category of ownership, we strove to identify outlets that are prototypical for this category and score high audience shares (based on unique users as measured by alexa.com, April 2012). As can be seen from Table 1, the sample contains one online edition from a public broadcaster and one from a private broadcaster, two online editions from corporate newspapers, two from independent newspapers, one online edition of a popular newspaper, and, finally, one stand-alone, made-for-web news provider. In countries where online-only news providers were not available, we picked the next best prototypical provider with sufficient editorial independence. To cover the three relevant models of media systems as outlined earlier, we included news outlets from the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Switzerland, France, and Italy (see Table 1).

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

For the content analysis, 1,660 stories were retrieved from the websites listed in Table 1. Over a period of seven days, selected from a constructed week in June 2012, we captured all political articles from the websites' front pages plus five political articles at 2 PM local time, yielding a total of 280 political articles per country. Political articles are defined as stories containing at least one political or politico-economic actor (individual or collective) that is mentioned at least twice. The latter was done to ensure that we sampled relevant articles. Six bilingual coders were trained thoroughly over a six-week period and supervised closely during the time of coding (October 2012 to February 2013) to ensure they understood the news routines of the selected outlets and the coding instructions. To ascertain intercoder reliability, a test was run at the conclusion of the coder training and the beginning of actual coding. It showed substantial agreement and satisfactory values of Cohen's kappa $k > .76$.

Measures

We use four items to measure the degree of enterprise reporting: whether a story is *written by an inhouse -staff* (as evidenced by the byline or text); whether it includes *first-hand observations* (reflected by clear indications that the author was present at the scene of the story's main event); *first hand inquiry* (coded when it was discernible from the story's manifest content that the author conducted most interviews with sources herself and consulted most documents herself); and *exclusive material* (coded if the story contains explicit references to the use of exclusively obtained, new data sources, documents, or insider information).

Revenue structure was operationalized to capture the extent of *one specific* stream of revenue, namely the degree of advertising dependency, measured by the *amount of advertisements* shown on the website of the coded political story. This was determined by calculating the proportion of advertising in relation to the editorial content (including additional stories and information not coded for this study) on the whole page, and then recoded to a four-point

scale (0%; <10%; 11-50%; >50%). The other two independent variables, *editorial mission* and *media system type*, were controlled by our sampling strategy.

Findings

The four indicators of enterprise reporting are closely related. The high correlations between *written by in-house staff*, *first-hand observation*, *first-hand inquiry*, and use of *exclusive material* indicate that they measure the same concept. We take these results (see Table 2 for details) as a clear call to aggregate all four indicators into one joint average index. The internal consistency of the Enterprise Reporting Index, consisting of z-standardized values, is acceptable as expressed by a Cronbach's α of .62.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

How strongly the use of enterprise reporting varies across the six media systems can be seen from the upper half of Table 3. Of all four indicators, the dimension *written by in-house staff* appears most frequently in online news, with country means ranging from .47 in Italy to .95 in the United States. The use of *exclusive material*, in contrast, occurs least often, with country means ranging from 0 in Italy to .07 in Great Britain. This seems plausible because laborious and time-consuming activities of enterprise reporting are more costly and, correspondingly, less likely to be performed by online news sites.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

When comparing data across media types, our results show that made-for-web news providers and publicly-owned outlets perform best (see lower half of Table 3). The high values of made-for-web news providers support the rationale of Hypothesis 1, stating that an editorial commitment toward substantive coverage can be more important than a lack of resources for performing enterprise reporting. Such a product-related strategy seems particularly relevant to made-for-web news providers because they have to build new brands and find their niche vis-à-vis established news leaders. The high values for public outlets indicate support for Hypothesis 2, as do the low values for popular news outlets and those from private

broadcasters. Advertising-oriented news websites show only weak indications of enterprise reporting (see lower half of Table 3).

In order to test Hypothesis 2 further, we also measured the extent to which websites show advertising on their editorial pages. We used this as a proxy for gauging advertising dependency and profit-oriented editorial mission. A breakdown of ownership type by advertising clutter reveals that commercially oriented outlets place the largest amounts of ads around their news stories; this applies, most of all, to corporate news media (see Table 4).

[TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

More importantly, heavy reliance on advertising is negatively correlated with the use of enterprise reporting (see Table 5). As a rule of thumb for the Internet age, we can state that the more ads are placed around a news story, the less likely it will contain signs of journalistic initiative or investigative impetus.

[TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

When relating enterprise reporting to different types of media systems, we find that “liberal” systems in our sample, the United States and Great Britain, perform particularly high on our index, whereas Italy, a representative of the “pluralist-polarized” model, scores lowest. This confirms earlier findings in cross-national news research that Anglo-American journalism is still geared more toward research activities related to the hard-news paradigm – at least more so than Mediterranean journalism (Donsbach, 1995; Esser & Umbricht, 2013). Hence, we conclude that the country-ranking on the right side of Table 6 supports Hypothesis 3 (expecting a greater affinity to enterprise reporting in news systems with higher degrees of journalistic professionalization), while the country-ranking on the left side of Table 6 underscores our earlier arguments in support of Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 (singling out made-for-web and public news providers as favorable environments for enterprise reporting).

[TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE]

However, a few qualifications are in order. First, in addition to the frequent use of enterprise reporting by British and U.S. journalists, their news organizations are also more likely to highlight their use as part of a branding strategy – in line with a longer history of media marketing efforts in those countries (Chan-Olmsted, 2006). Second, when taking a closer look at individual dimensions of enterprise reporting (as depicted in Table 3), the “liberal” news systems do not always take the lead. In fact, only the dimension of *written by in-house staff* is very high for British and U.S. outlets while the other three more elaborate practices are used sometimes more frequently in other news systems. Particularly the low scores for the U.S. stand out here. It seems as if the highly commercialized U.S. news outlets often avoid engaging visibly in extensive on-site reporting while in other countries – particularly those with a strong public-service broadcasting sector and a strong independent press (like Great Britain and Germany) – this practice seems more common. This assumption also corresponds with findings on the relationship between market conditions and news performance cross-nationally (see Levy & Nielsen, 2010; Nielsen, 2012).

On the basis of the two rankings in Table 6, the logical next step is to explore whether organizational or national factors are more relevant for explaining differences in enterprise reporting. A one-way analysis of variance finds country differences to explain slightly more variance than ownership-type differences (partial η^2 values for country is .31 and for ownership type is .15; see Table 7). We thus have to dismiss Hypothesis 4 which claimed that media-ownership differences were more relevant than media-system differences.

[TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE]

In the same breath, we would like to point out that the overall message of Table 7 fits perfectly with a related argument of ours made earlier, namely that organizational and national influences interact with each other and should be taken into consideration jointly when explaining enterprise reporting. The combined contribution of both predictors to explaining differences in enterprise reporting is reflected in a partial η^2 of .76 that far exceeds the isolated

contributions of the individual predictors (see Table 7). It is thus not only structural and cultural factors at the *national* level but also *organizational* goals and ownership forms that need to be considered. When financial pressures on national media markets increase, it is doubtful if outlets with a primarily profit-oriented editorial mission will be prepared and motivated to provide solidly, independently researched public-affairs coverage.

Conclusion

This study defines enterprise reporting as independent reporting that originates from in-house newsroom staff and includes on-site research, first-hand investigations, obtaining background information and conducting original interviews. The relevance of the concept lies in the fact that this reporting style – as a key precondition of accountability journalism – is essential for a functioning democracy. On the other hand, there are good reasons to assume that, due to the additional costs and resources involved, this reporting style will be applied less extensively in the economically fragile environment of online journalism. In view of the growing shift of news journalism to the Internet, this would pose a potentially serious threat to democracy in the long-run.

Whether this will happen or not is unclear and will essentially depend on various contextual factors. From the available literature, we have deduced three factors that can explain differences in the extent of enterprise reporting. At the organizational level, it is editorial mission (profit- or quality-oriented goals) and revenue structure (significant or minor advertising dependency); at the national level, it is professionalism of news journalism (liberal, democratic-corporatist or polarized-pluralist media system). A content analysis of 48 online news sites in six countries, which were chosen to vary these three predictors systematically, comes to the conclusion that the most favorable opportunity structures for manifest enterprise reporting are

- at the organizational level: public ownership, an editorial mission towards quality (even if resources are small), and minor advertising reliance;

- at the national level: clear professional distance to the political (state) pole and to the commercial (market) pole so that independent fact-gathering and transparency-enhancing journalism – focused on matters of substance – remain possible.

Inevitably, our study has some limitations. One might ask why we have not looked at the extent of news-agency material more explicitly. If we had solely been interested in this question, we probably would have conducted an input-output analysis comparing incoming wire materials with published stories. However, we were more interested in the wider concept of journalistic initiative and believe that our measures of enterprise reporting were able to determine the degree of use of agency copy, although we cannot fully be sure about that. Another problem is that, in some countries, the differences in the amounts of advertising are small, even across different organizational types. For instance, U.S. news sites have very high overall amounts of advertising. We would like to suggest that future studies measure advertising dependency and editorial mission more accurately by additional means (such as interviews) and combine these insights with content-analysis data. This would be an important step forward toward a better understanding of the drivers of enterprise reporting.

Nevertheless, we believe that our study makes an important and meaningful contribution to the ongoing debate on the service of online-based journalism to society. The large differences in the extent of enterprise reporting clearly indicate that it is dependent on conducive or restrictive circumstances. The great importance of the editorial mission runs like a continuous thread through all our findings. It can either be decreed by public-service remit (in the case of public broadcasters) or set as a self-imposed target for reasons of market positioning and brand distinction (for instance, to differentiate oneself from disappointing mainstream media). In both cases, the organization must be able to afford the strategy (through secured streams of revenue) or must desire to invest in it anyway (for reasons of reputation-gain or social responsibility). A possible media-policy recommendation to be drawn from this study is that public media will still be able to make a positive contribution in the future, and that

incentives are needed for online news providers to put less emphasis on advertising appeal and more on product quality.

References

- Benson, R., Blach-Ørsten, M., Powers, M., Willig, I., & Zambrano, S. V. (2012). Media Systems Online and Off: Comparing the Form of News in the United States, Denmark, and France. *Journal of Communication*, 62(1), 21–38. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01625.x
- Chan-Olmsted, S. M. (2005). *Competitive Strategy for Media Firms. Strategic and Brand Management in Changing Media Markets*. New York: Routledge.
- Christians, C. G., Glasser, T. L., McQuail, D., Nordenstrang, K., & White, R. A. (2009). *Normative Theories of the Media. Journalism in Democratic Societies*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Curran, J., Iyengar, S., Lund, A. B., & Salovaara-Moring, I. (2009). Media System, Public Knowledge and Democracy: A Comparative Study. *European Journal of Communication*, 24(1), 5–26. doi:10.1177/0267323108098943
- Demers, D. P. (1996). Corporate Newspaper Structure, Profits and Organizational Goals. *Journal of Media Economics*, 9(2), 1–23.
- Domingo, D., Quandt, T., Heinonen, A., Paulussen, S., Singer, J. B., & Vujnovic, M. (2008). Participatory Journalism Practices in the Media and Beyond. *Journalism Practice*, 2(3), 326–342. doi:10.1080/17512780802281065
- Donsbach, W. (1995). Lapdogs, Watchdogs and Junkyard Dogs. *Media Studies Journal*, 9(3), 17–30.
- Downie, L., & Schudson, M. (2009). *The Reconstruction of American Journalism. Columbia Journalism Review* (November/December), 28–51.
- Esser, F., & Umbricht, A. (2013). Competing models of journalism? Political affairs coverage in US, British, German, Swiss, French and Italian newspapers. *Journalism*, 15(8), 989–1007. doi:10.1177/1464884913482551
- Ferree, M., Gamson, W. A., Gerhards, J., & Rucht, D. (2002). *Shaping Aborting Discourse. Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems. Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hansen, K. A. (1991). Source Diversity and Newspaper Enterprise Journalism. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 68(3), 474–482. doi:10.1177/107769909106800318
- Jones, A. (2010). *Losing the News. The Future of News that Feeds Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Krumsvik, A. H., Skogerbø, E., & Storsul, T. (2013). Size , Ownership and Innovation in Newspapers. In T. Storsul & A. H. Krumsvik (Eds.), *Media Innovations: A Multidisciplinary Study of Change* (pp. 93–110). Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Kurpius, D. D. (2002). Sources and Civic Journalism: Changing Patterns of Reporting? *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(4), 853–866. doi:10.1177/107769900207900406
- Levy, D., & Nielsen, R. K. (2010). The Changing Business of Journalism and Its Implications for Democracy. In R. K. Nielsen & D. Levy (Eds.), *The Changing Business of Journalism and Its Implications for Democracy*. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. doi:10.1080/1461670X.2012.662412
- McQuail, D. (1992). *Media Performance: Mass Communication and the Public Interest*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Nielsen, R. K. (2012). *Ten Years that Shook the Media World*. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Picard, R. G. (2010). The Future of the News Industry. In J. Curran (Ed.), *Media and Society* (pp. 365–379). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Picard, R. G., & van Weezel, A. (2008). Capital and Control: Consequences of Different Forms of Newspaper Ownership. *International Journal on Media Management*, 10(1), 22–31. doi:10.1080/14241270701820473
- Quandt, T. (2008). (No) News On The World Wide Web? A Comparative Content Analysis of Online News in Europe and the United States. *Journalism Studies*, 9(5), 717–738. doi:10.1080/14616700802207664
- Siebert, G., Gerth, M. a., & Rademacher, P. (2011). Brand Identity-Driven Decision Making by Journalists and Media Managers: The MBAC Model as a Theoretical Framework. *International Journal on Media Management*, 13(1), 53–70. doi:10.1080/14241277.2010.545363
- Steensen, S. (2011). Online Journalism and the Promises of New Technology. *Journalism Studies*, 12(3), 311–327. doi:10.1080/1461670X.2010.501151
- Stetka, V., & Örnebring, H. (2013). Investigative Journalism in Central and Eastern Europe: Autonomy, Business Models, and Democratic Roles. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 18(4), 413–435. doi:10.1177/1940161213495921
- Tewksbury, D., & Rittenberg, J. (2012). *News on the Internet. Information and Citizenship in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Table 1: *Sample: Types of Online Media Ownership*

	USA	GBR	GER	SUI	FRA	ITA
Public Broadcaster	NPR.org	BBC News	Tagesschau.de	Tagesschau.sf.tv	Info.france2.fr	RAI News24
Private Broadcaster	CNN News	Sky News Online	N-tv.de	SwissInfo.ch	TF1 Info Online	Sky.it
Corporate	WashingtonPost.com	TheTimes.co.uk	Welt Online	Tagesanzeiger.ch	Figaro Online	Repubblica.it
	LATimes.com	DailyMail.co.uk	Derwesten.de	Suedostschweiz.ch	Ouestfrance.fr	Corriere.it
Independent	NYTimes.com	Guardian.co.uk	FAZ.net	NZZ.ch	LeMonde.fr	ilFattoQuotidiano.it
	Tampabay.com	Telegraph.co.uk	Sueddeutsche.de	Landbote.ch	Libération.fr	Unita.it
Popular Newspaper	NY Daily News	TheSun.co.uk	Bild.de	Blick.ch	Leparisien.fr	Leggo.it
Made-for-Web	Huffington Post	Open Democracy.net	Spiegel Online	News.ch	Rue89.com	Linkiesta.it

Table 2: *Correlations between Indicators of Enterprise Reporting*

	Written by in-house staff	Based on first-hand observation	Based on first-hand enquiry	Use of exclusive material
Written by in-house staff	1	.194**	.481**	.133**
Based on first-hand observation			.279**	.361**
Based on first-hand enquiry				.277**
Use of exclusive material				1

Note: N = 1658 stories. Values are Pearson's correlation coefficients. Marked values are statistically significant at the ** $p < .01$ level. Internal consistency of Index: Cronbach's alpha $\alpha = .62$

Table 3: *Mean Standardized Dimensions of Enterprise Reporting*

Country	Dimensions							
	Written by in-house staff		Based on first-hand observation		Based on first-hand enquiry		Use of exclusive material	
	<i>M</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>% of total</i>
USA	0.95	24.2	0.04	8.5	0.31	16.1	0.01	5.0
GBR	0.91	23.2	0.08	19.5	0.36	18.9	0.07	31.7
GER	0.58	14.9	0.13	30.5	0.40	21.0	0.06	26.7
SUI	0.50	12.2	0.07	16.9	0.27	13.4	0.05	21.7
FRA	0.54	13.7	0.08	17.8	0.52	27.5	0.03	13.3
ITA	0.47	11.8	0.03	6.8	0.06	3.0	0.00	1.7
Ownership type	<i>M</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>% of total</i>
Public Bcaster	0.62	13.8	0.11	22.9	0.37	17.2	0.06	23.3
Private Bcaster	0.46	7.2	0.05	7.6	0.25	8.3	0.02	5.0
Corporate	0.70	26.5	0.04	12.7	0.28	22.2	0.02	11.7
Independent	0.70	26.6	0.08	28.0	0.31	24.1	0.02	15.0
Popular	0.54	10.2	0.03	5.9	0.27	10.6	0.03	10.0
Made-for-Web	0.83	15.7	0.13	22.9	0.45	17.6	0.10	35.0

Note: N = 1660 stories. Due to rounding, frequencies or percentages may not exactly add up to totals.

Table 4: *Amount of Advertisement per Ownership Type*

Ownership	Advertisements around news story			
Type	<i>no ads</i>	<i><10%</i>	<i>11-50%</i>	<i>>50%</i>
Public Bcaster	13.5%	60.8%	25.7%	0.0%
Private Bcaster	5.8%	27.2%	65.9%	1.2%
Corporate	0.0%	5.6%	83.3%	11.2%
Independent	0.2%	4.6%	85.9%	9.4%
Popular	0.0%	8.3%	85.0%	6.8%
Made-for-web	0.0%	21.7%	71.5%	6.8%

Note: N = 1658 stories. Due to rounding, frequencies or percentages may not exactly add up to totals.

Table 5: *Correlations between the Dimensions of Enterprise Reporting and Amount of Advertising*

	Written by in-house staff	First-hand observation	First-hand enquiry	Use of exclusive material
Advertisements around news story	-.176**	-.117**	-.143**	-.085**

Note: N = 1658. Values are Pearson's correlation coefficients. Marked values are statistically significant at the **p < .01 level.

Table 6: *Enterprise-Reporting Index: Values and Rankings*

Ownership Type	M	Rank	Countries	M	Rank
Made-for-web	0.66	1	GBR	0.62	1
Public Bcaster	0.51	2	USA	0.57	2
Independent	0.48	3	GER	0.52	3
Corporate	0.45	4	FRA	0.51	4
Popular	0.38	5	SUI	0.38	5
Private Bcaster	0.34	6	ITA	0.24	6

Note: Values are z-standardized dimension indices.

Table 7: *Influences of Country and Ownership Type*

		Country	Ownership Type	Country * Ownership Type
Enterprise-Reporting Index	<i>part. η^2</i>	.314***	.148***	.761***
	<i>p</i>	<.001	<.001	<.001
	<i>F</i>	151.6	57.6	79.6

Note: Values are significant at the ***p < .001 level.